

1 Anthony E. McNamer (SBN 178911)
2 **MCNAMER AND COMPANY**
3 920 SW Third Ave, Suite 200
4 Portland, Oregon 97204
5 Telephone: 503.727.2504
6 Facsimile: 503.727.2501
7 E-Mail: anthony@mcnamerlaw.com

8
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 JONATHAN BROWNING STUDIOS, INC.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JONATHAN BROWNING STUDIOS, INC.,

Case No.: C 07-3983 JSW

Plaintiff,

DENYING REQUEST TO SEAL

v.

**~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER SEALING WITHOUT
PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO PREJUDICE
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND
SUPPORTING DECLARATIONS**

**VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, LAS
VEGAS SANDS, LLC, LAS VEGAS SANDS
CORP., and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,**

Defendant.

Date: August 7, 2009
Time: 9:00am
Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White
Courtroom: 2, 17th Floor

**VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, LAS
VEGAS SANDS, LLC, LAS VEGAS SANDS
CORP.,**

Complaint Filed: August 2, 2007

Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

**KIRK NIX ASSOCIATES INC. DBA KNA
INTERIOR DESIGNS, a California corporation,**

Third-Party Defendant.

On July 17, 2009, counsel for the Plaintiff Jonathan Browning Studios, Inc., filed copies of its Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (the "Opposition") and Supporting Declarations of Anthony McNamer, Jonathan Browning and Mark Heithaus (collectively the "Declarations") in a sealed envelope with the Court. On July 16, 2009, counsel for the Plaintiff Jonathan Browning Studios, Inc. filed redacted copies of its Motion and Declarations with the Court's ECF system.

The Opposition and Declarations contain information that is privileged or protectable as a trade secret to either and both Plaintiff and Defendant. The request for sealing is narrowly tailored, however, not sealing only those portions of the documents designated as Confidential by one of the parties pursuant to the Protective Order entered by this Court on June 13, 2008. Therefore, the Court [^] ~~HEREBY ORDERS that Plaintiff's Motion and Declarations be filed under seal.~~

SO ORDERED.

The request to file the redacted portions under seal is DENIED as overly broad. For instance, there is no reason to seal portions of argument related to other cases. (*See, e.g.*, Opp. Br. at 6:17-19; 11:12-12:9).

DATED: August 5, 2009

By: _____

Hon. Jeffrey S. White

